

**REMARKS**

**Upon receipt of this response, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicant to arrange a telephone interview concerning the inventive merits of this application.**

Fig. 1 of the drawings is amended, per the attached, to overcome a few noted informalities contained therein. The new Replacement Sheet of formal drawing, accompanying this Response, incorporates all of the requested drawing amendment(s) to Fig. 1. If any further amendment to the drawings is believed necessary, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicant to discuss the same.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons noted in the official action. Rejected claim 14 is accordingly amended, by the above claim amendments, and the presently pending claims are now believed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention, thereby overcoming all of the raised § 112, second paragraph, rejections. The entered claim amendments are directed solely at overcoming the raised indefiniteness rejection(s) and are not directed at distinguishing the present invention from the art of record in this case.

Next, claims 8, 9, 12 and 14 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Wireman `506 (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,506) in view of Takaoki `672 (JP 59175672). The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised obviousness rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 10, 11 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim(s). In accordance with this indication, claims 10 and 13 are both now amended to be independent claims and those two independent claims are now believed to be allowable. As claims 11 and 16-19 all depend from amended independent claim 10 and as claims 20 and 21 both depend from amended independent claim 13, each one of those dependent claims is also believed to be allowable as well.

With respect to claims 8, 9, 12 and 14, the above claim amendments and new claims as well as the following remarks are submitted concerning the allowability of those claims.

Turning now to Wireman `506, this reference arguable relates to cog wheel 32 and 37 which are arranged on a main shaft and the transmission further includes first and second countershafts. However, as the Examiner appreciates, Wireman `506 fails to in any way teach, suggest, disclose or remotely hint at the disk connected with the cog wheel for biasing or

pushing the cog wheel against the disk by spring action. To allegedly overcome this deficiency, the Examiner combines the teachings and disclosures of Takaoki `672 with Wireman `506.

The secondary reference of Takaoki `672 arguable relates to a pair of engaged gear and an elastic member (disk) 4 connected with the gear 2 and supported against a side facing the gearing 1. The elastic member 4 is fixed to one of the gears 2 and a top outer periphery of the elastic member 4 has a friction member 5 which is slidably maintained in contact with the other gear 1. By this arrangement, the engaging faces of the pair of gears 1, 2 are maintained in contact at all times by the friction generated by the relative speed difference between the pair of gears 1, 2.

The presently claimed invention, on the other hand, is not directed at achieving friction between the engaging faces of the pair of gears 1, 2 due to the relative speed difference between the pair of gears 1, 2 as with the applied art of Takaoki `672. The presently claimed invention is more specifically directed at biasing the at least one cog wheel 3, by spring action, against the disk 7 to suppress wobbling movement of the at least one cog wheel (3). The presently claimed invention, as now recited in independent claim 8, requires a washer disk 4, carried by the at least one cog wheel 3, to be sandwiched between a pair of washer disks 5 which are supported by the main shaft 6. Neither of the applied references of Wireman `506 and/or Takaoki `672 in any way teach, suggest, disclose or remotely hint at such arrangement.

In order to emphasize the above noted distinctions between the presently claimed invention and the applied art, independent claim 8 of this application now recites the features of "and the at least one cog wheel (3) being biased, by spring action, against the disk (7) to suppress wobbling movement of the at least one cog wheel (3); and a washer disk (4) carried by the at least one cog wheel (3) is sandwiched between a pair of washer disks (5) supported by the main shaft (6)." Such features are believed to clearly and patentably distinguish the presently claimed invention from all of the art of record, including the applied art. That is, neither Wireman `506 nor Takaoki `672, either alone or in any permissible combination with one another, in any way teaches, suggests, discloses or remotely hints at the above recited features of claim 8.

If any further amendment to this application is believed necessary to advance prosecution and place this case in allowable form, the Examiner is courteously solicited to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicant to discuss the same.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn at this time. If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's view concerning the withdrawal of the outstanding rejection(s) or applicability of the Wireman `506 and/or Takaoki `672 references, the Applicant respectfully requests the

10/591,028

Examiner to indicate the specific passage or passages, or the drawing or drawings, which contain the necessary teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure required by case law. As such teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure is not present in the applied references, the raised rejection should be withdrawn at this time. Alternatively, if the Examiner is relying on his/her expertise in this field, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter an affidavit substantiating the Examiner's position so that suitable contradictory evidence can be entered in this case by the Applicant.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn and this application is now placed in a condition for allowance. Action to that end, in the form of an early Notice of Allowance, is courteously solicited by the Applicant at this time.

The Applicant respectfully requests that any outstanding objection(s) or requirement(s), as to the form of this application, be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated for this case.

In the event that there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge the same or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account (Account No. 04-0213).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Bujold, Reg. No. 32,018  
**Customer No. 020210**  
Davis & Bujold, P.L.L.C.  
112 Pleasant Street  
Concord, NH 03301-2931  
Telephone 603-226-7490  
Facsimile 603-226-7499  
E-mail: [patent@davisandbujold.com](mailto:patent@davisandbujold.com)



1 / 2




Fig. 1

as filed  
8-29-06  
4/6